

**REMARKS**

Claims 2 and 13 have been cancelled. Claims 34-50 have been added. Claims 1, 3-12, 14-50 are all the claims pending in the application.

***Formal matters***

Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the drawings filed on April 2, 2001 and for acknowledging claim to foreign priority and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for reviewing and initialing the documents in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted September 2, 2004.

***Claim objections***

Claim 18 stands objected to for informalities. Applicant has amended the claim as suggested by the Examiner and therefore respectfully requests that the objection be removed.

***Claim rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts the term "a memory device" in line 8 of claim 2 is unclear. Applicant has amended claim 1 in order to clarify that the memory device therein is "a memory device of said video camera."

***Claim rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102/103***

Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,413,277 to Murray.

Applicant has amended claim 1 in order to include the limitations from claim 2, and has accordingly cancelled claim 2. Claim 1 recites the limitation of measuring workload on said worker during at least one of said jobs. The Examiner maintains that Murray teaches this limitation. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Murray discloses recording the operations of a worker, such as the different operations performed in making garments (e.g. picking up a pocket and shirt, positioning the shirt, sewing a seam, repositioning the shirt, etc.). (col. 6, lines 5-15). The person recording the operations of the worker can press various buttons which cause a time to be started and displayed on a display screen or a sequence number to be displayed, and recorded on the tape, e.g. the snapback switch 36. (col. 6, line 62 to col. 7, line 10). Murray also discloses using mechanical sensor inputs in order to measure various parameters, e.g. the movement of the needle or machine speed. (col. 9, lines 62-65; col. 10, lines 45-50). This video is then played back so that the operator can get real time feedback (col. 11, lines 14-20), and can get additional information metrics in answer to the operator's question: "how did I do?". (col. 12, lines 13-24). This metric information is the total time for making a garment (col. 12, lines 22-24), average time per garment or step (col. 12, lines 30-32), or comparison of the operator's times with other operators' times (col. 12, lines 51-55). Murray also discloses interaction between the operator and the analyzer system (col. 12, lines 65-67). However, these operations, parameters, and metrics are used merely to provide feedback to the worker so that the individual worker may improve his or her process. Thus, Murray does not disclose measuring the workload on the worker, as recited by amended claim 1.

Moreover, since Murray does not disclose measuring the workload on the worker, it is impossible for Murray to disclose inputting data of measured workload into a personal computer, as also recited by amended claim 1.

Therefore, amended claim 1 is patentable over Murray for at least these two reasons.

Claims 3-11 are patentable based on their dependencies.

Applicant has amended claim 12 to incorporate the limitations of claim 13, and has accordingly cancelled claim 13. Thus, amended claim 12 recites a limitation which is substantially similar to that discussed above with respect to amended claim 1, and amended claim 12 is patentable over Murray for at least the two reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1.

Claim 23 recites the limitation of selecting one of the displayed job titles through an input device connected to said personal computer, to enter the job title at each break point between the jobs. The Examiner maintains that Murray discloses or suggests this feature. Murray does seem to disclose a cueing function which is similar to a break point. (col. 11, lines 40-55). However, in Murray, the cueing feature is only used to allow the operator or user to go forward or backward to desired index points. (col. 11, lines 47-50). Thus, Murray does not disclose selecting a displayed job title and entering the job title at each break point, as required by claim 23. Therefore, claim 23 is patentable over Murray for at least this reason.

Moreover, claim 23 has been amended to recite a feature similar to that present in amended claim 1, which has been shown above to be patentable over Murray. Therefore, claim 23 is patentable over Murray for this additional reason.

Claim 24 is patentable based on its dependency.

Claims 25 and 29 each recite limitations similar to those present in claim 23, discussed above. Therefore, claims 25 and 29 are patentable over Murray for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 23. Claims 26-28 and 30-31 are patentable based on their dependencies.

Claim 32 recites a limitation similar to that present in amended claim 1, discussed above. Therefore, claim 32 is patentable over Murray for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the patentability of amended claim 1. Claim 33 is patentable based on its dependency.

***New claims***

Applicant has added claims 34-50 in order to more fully claim aspects of the invention.

***Examiner citation***

At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner refers to a Wikipedia definition. Applicant does not concede any limiting definition of a sensor with respect to such citation.

***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin C. Kunzendorf  
Registration No. 58,308

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 6, 2006